



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,408	12/05/2003	Jon Swanson	0920.68319	9759
24978 7590 04/14/2010 GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER ANDERSON, FOLASHADE				
ART UNIT 3623		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 04/14/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/728,408

**Applicant(s)**

SWANSON, JON

**Examiner**

FOLASHADE ANDERSON

**Art Unit**

3623

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19, 20, 22-24 and 26-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-20, 22-24 and 26-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This non-final office action is in response to Applicant's submission filed on 01/14/2010.

### ***Status of Claims***

2. Currently, claims 1-17, 19, 20, 22, 26-41 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 31, 36, and 37 are amended. Claims 38-41 are newly added. Claims 18, 21, and 23-25 are canceled.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. Applicant's amendments to claim 1 are sufficient to overcome the claim objection set forth in the previous Office Action.
4. Applicant's amendments to claim 4 are sufficient to overcome the claim objection set forth in the previous Office Action.
5. Applicant's amendment to claim 6 is sufficient to overcome the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.
6. Applicant's amendments to claims 7, 10, 36 and 37 are sufficient to overcome the 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant makes the following arguments with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejections set forth in the previous action, see Remarks p. 24:

- a. Independent Claims 1 and 31 are allowable because Semaan teaches away from allocating a network interface location including at least an IP address and a port after receiving said request to join said meeting from said first of said plurality of attendees, and any combination with Gorsuch (alleged to teach allocation of resources after receiving a request to join) is improper since the references teach away from one another and since any such combination would cause the references to fail their intended purpose.
  - b. Semaan fails to disclose determining the total required bandwidth for the meeting and limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate as recited by claims 11, 31 and 40
  - c. Semaan fails to disclose directing users with insufficient bandwidth to link to a subset of the plurality of data streams as recited by claims 12 and 41.
  - d. Semaan fails to disclose the recited steps of claims 7 and 37 related to determining total bandwidth required.
  - e. Haims fails to disclose or suggest an executable meeting invitation as recited by claim 14
  - f. All dependant claims are also allowable since these claims depend from allowing independent claims
8. Applicant's argument 5(a) has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Semaan teaches "reservation request will typically include a plurality of multi-media conference parameters . . . starting time, the duration, the address of the users . . . resources necessary for the conference . . . the reservation controllers are party to the

reservation domain and have joined the reservation request channel.” (Semaan col. 6, lines 8-19). Semaan does not specify how far in advance the reservation for the meeting must be made; therefore the silence of Semaan does not teach nor imply that the method/system could not be used for a spontaneous, ad-hoc meeting as the Applicant contends. Nor does combining Semaan’s teaching with those of Gorsuch (i.e. “instantaneous bandwidth . . . are met by dynamically allocating multiple sub-channels . . . on an as needed basis for each session” Gorsuch col. 2, lines 37-40) destroy the system of Semaan. Also see Semaan’s teachings on continuous connections and dynamic connections (Semaan col. 12, lines 19-40). It is therefore maintained that the combination of the old and known elements in the art as taught by Semaan and Gorsuch would have been recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art that the results of the combination were predictable.

9. Applicant’s argument 5(b) has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Semaan teaches “the resources necessary for the conference . . . the parameters placed on the request channel are available (i.e. are received by) the reservation controller,” (Semaan col. 6, lines 8-19) “conference quality parameter . . . specifies the video and audio (bandwidth) desired, as well as the bandwidth desired for other data” (Semaan col. 9, lines 10-13), and “task of the server part are to establish and maintain multiple simultaneous MCS connections with users . . . monitor the status of all MCUs connected to the controller . . . accept or refuse the request of the users . . . based on any desired acceptance algorithm” (Semaan col. 10, lines 43-55). Therefore teachings of Semaan would render the claimed limitation of determining the total required

bandwidth for the meeting and limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. The rejection as set forth in the previous Office Action is maintained.

10. *Applicant's argument 5(c) has been fully considered and is persuasive.*

*Therefore, the rejection set forth in the previous Action has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection laid out below.*

11. Applicant's argument 5(d) has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Semaan teaches determining total bandwidth required in at least col. 9, lines 8-19 "conference quality parameter . . . specifies the video and audio (bandwidth) desired, as well as the bandwidth desired for other data" and col. 8, lines 37-40 "the preferred customer-provided parameters . . . are conference mode, conference quality, physical channel selection." The teachings of Semaan for setting required parameters are the equivalent of the determining step of the claimed limitation, since it is logical that the determination must be made before establishing the requirement. The rejection as set forth in the previous Office Action is maintained.

12. Applicant's argument 5(e) has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Haims teaches "invitations may be distributed via electronic mail message . . . and include a link or URL allowing each attendee to point . . . to an appropriate Web page at the time of the planned communication" (Haims par. 0094). Where providing the link to a webpage through which the conference is to take place without requiring more of the user to enter the planned communication. It is noted that the link provides the location

Art Unit: 3623

of the executable file i.e. the web page; thus once the link is activated the execution is automatic. . The rejection as set forth in the previous Office Action is maintained.

13. Applicant's arguments 5(f) amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

14. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

15. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant does not have support in the originally filed specification for the claimed limitation of "creating a pass key for entry to said meeting and sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication."

16. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant does not have support in the originally filed specification for the claimed limitation of "determining that said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees does not have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting, and denying admission to said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees." The specification only limits admission if there is not sufficient bandwidth not because the meeting are members of a fourth group of attendees.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 1-5, 11-17, 19-20, 26, 27 and 29-35, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. 5,680,392) in view of Haims et al (US Pub 2003/0105820 A1) and Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1).

As per claim 1, Semaan discloses a method for organizing a virtual meeting between a plurality of attendees on a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a meeting date, a meeting start time, meeting duration, and a meeting code, storing said meeting date, said meeting start time, said meeting duration, and said meeting code in a meeting file (col. 6, lines 8-19; col. 8, lines 45-50; Figure 3);

storing said meeting file in a memory accessible to the network (Figures 3-4);

communicating a meeting invitation to said plurality of attendees over the network, said invitation including at least said meeting date, said meeting start time, said meeting code, and a meeting entry portal (col. 8, lines 51-64);

receiving a request to join the meeting from a first of plurality of attendees (col. 6, lines 20-52):

said network resources including at least one IP address (col.3, lines 19-23) and at least one port for a network interface connected to the network (fig. 1, col. 5, lines 8-15) for connecting said plurality of attendees for communication with one another during the meeting (col. 6, lines 20-52), said network resources sufficient to communicate a plurality of real time data streams over the network, said plurality of real time data streams including at least one real time video data stream and at least one real time audio data stream (col. 6, lines 24-52; col. 8, lines 65-67).

Semaan does not teach

communicating a meeting invitation including a meeting entry portal and allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join said from said first of said plurality of attendees

Haims teaches in the analogous art of facilitating online communications, communicating a meeting invitation including a meeting entry portal (par. 0094, where it is old and well known that a link is a type of enter portal)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan the communicating a meeting invitation including a meeting entry portal as taught by Haims since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Haims does not teach allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees

Gorsuch teaches in the analogous art of dynamic bandwidth allocation, allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees (col. 2, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan and Haims the allocating network resources for said meeting, after receiving said request to join from said first of said plurality of attendees as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 2, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the step of determining a required bandwidth for the meeting and storing said required bandwidth in said meeting file (col., 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 3, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein each of said plurality of meeting attendees will be streaming a plurality of real time data streams to the meeting, and wherein the method further includes the step of determining the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 4, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 3 and Semaan further discloses including the step of determining the total bandwidth required for the virtual meeting by summing the bandwidth required for each of said plurality of real time data streams from each of said plurality of attendees (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 5, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 4 and Semaan further discloses wherein said plurality of real time data streams includes at least a plurality of video data streams and at least one audio data stream (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28).

As per claim 11, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of determining the total required bandwidth for the meeting, of determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees, and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting (col. 6, lines 8-13 and 24-26; col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28, col. 10, lines 43-55).

As per claim 12, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Gorsuch further discloses including the steps of determining the total required bandwidth for the meeting (col. 8, 37-40), of determining the total available bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 6, lines 59-63), and of directing any attendees that do not have sufficient bandwidth available to link to a

subset of said plurality of data streams being communicated during the meeting (col. 10, lines 37-32).

As per claim 13, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said meeting file further includes at least one application to be used during the meeting (col. 8, lines 11-31).

As per claim 14, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Haims further discloses wherein said invitation is an executable file that upon execution takes all steps necessary to connect to said virtual meeting (par. 0094).

As per claim 15, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said meeting file further specifies a display template for displaying video streams during the meeting (col. 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 16, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 15 and Semaan further discloses wherein said display template includes application geometry for displaying images (col. 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 17, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the step of selecting a display template for displaying at least one video data stream during the meeting (col. 9, lines 10-27).

As per claim 19, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of linking each remaining of said plurality of users to said meeting resources when a request for entry is received from said remaining of said plurality of users (col. 6, lines 44-64).

As per claim 20, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network resources include at least one network interface having an address, and further including storing said at least one network interface address in said meeting file (col. 5, lines 38-58).

As per claim 22, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein the step of allocating said network resources for said meeting comprises selecting said network resources from a list of available network resources (col. 6, lines 20-43; Figures 4-4a).

As per claim 26, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses wherein said network resources include at least one network interface address, and further including the step of storing said at least one network interface address in said meeting file (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 27, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Haims further discloses wherein said meeting entry portal is a URL and wherein said network interface location is different for said meeting entry point (par. 94).

As per claim 29, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and further including the step of providing a network address for each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 3, lines 19-23; col. 7, lines 42-52).

As per claim 30, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of creating a pass key for entry to said meeting, of including said pass key with said invitation communicated to

said plurality of attendees, and of storing said pass key in said meeting file (col. 8, lines 60-61).

As per claim 31, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 1 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim. Claim 31 recites the additional limitations of, which Semaan teaches in the following locations:

storing said at least one network interface location in said meeting file (Figures 3-4, col.3, lines 53-56), linking said first meeting attendee to said network interface (col. 4, lines 10-16);

receiving a subsequent request from a second of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 8, line 65-co1.9, line 28; col. 10, line 64- col. 11, line 29; Figure 5), and linking said second meeting attendee to said network location (col. 4, lines 10-16); and

determining the total bandwidth of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 8, lines 37-40), and limiting said meeting attendees to only those having sufficient bandwidth to participate in said meeting (col. 10, lines 43-55).

As per claim 32, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 14 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim. Claim 32 recites the additional limitations of, which Semaan teaches in the following locations:

sufficient to connect said each of said plurality of attendees (col. 6, lines 28-35)

As per claim 33, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claims 14, 15, and 16 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim.

As per claim 34, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 4 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim. Claim 34 recites the additional limitations of, which Semaan teaches in the following locations:

the bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 6, lines 28-35)

As per claim 35, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 3 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim.

As per claim 38, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further teaches including the steps of determining the IP address of each of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 3, lines 19-23), and of limiting said meeting attendees to only those having an IP address listed in said meeting file (col. 8, lines 51-56).

As per claim 40, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further teaches including the steps of:

determining that said second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting (col. 6, lines 8-13 and 24-26; col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28, col. 10, lines 43-55)



determining that said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees does not have sufficient bandwidth available to attend said meeting , and denying admission to said fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 10, lines 43-55).

Semaan does not teach

receiving a request to join the meeting from a second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees;

connecting said second and third of said plurality of attendees to said meeting wherein said second and third attendees share said plurality of real time data streams with one another and said first of said plurality of meeting attendees;

receiving a request to join the meeting from a fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees;

Gorsuch teaches

receiving a request to join the meeting from a second and third of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 2, lines 37-40);

connecting said second and third of said plurality of attendees to said meeting wherein said second and third attendees share said plurality of real time data streams with one another and said first of said plurality of meeting attendees(col. 2, lines 37-40).;

receiving a request to join the meeting from a fourth of said plurality of meeting attendees (col. 2, lines 37-40);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan and Haims the receiving and connecting features as taught by Gorsuch since the claimed invention is merely a

combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

19. Claim 6-10, 36, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. 5,680,392), Haims et al (US Pub 2003/0105820 A1) and Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1), as applied above in view of Etorre et al (U.S. 6,594,265)

As per claim 6, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 Gorsuch further discloses the steps of determining the total bandwidth available to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees (col. 10, lines 23-26) as well as information about outside traffic (col. 9, lines 4-10);

However Gorsuch does not expressly teach through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said each of said plurality of attendees to the virtual meeting.

Etorre teaches each of said plurality of attendees through consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated to the virtual meeting will be carried over a linkage connecting said each of said plurality of attendees to the virtual meeting (Col. 25, lines 19-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch the consideration of whether additional traffic unrelated as taught by Etorre since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each

element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 7, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 6 and Semaan further discloses wherein the virtual meeting is a first virtual meeting and wherein the step of determining the total bandwidth to communicate with each of said plurality of attendees includes determining whether a second virtual meeting may consume bandwidth resources of said attendee, and wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another, (col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 28; col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 29; Figure 5).

As per claim 8, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 7 and Semaan further discloses wherein least one of said plurality of attendees is linked to the network by a linkage shared by an attendee of said second virtual meeting, said second virtual meeting being at least partially concurrent with said first virtual meeting (col. 9, lines 6-9; col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 29; Figure 5).

As per claim 9, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 6 and Semaan further discloses including the steps of:

determining what linkage each of said plurality of attendees is connected to the network with and determining whether any additional of said plurality of attendees are connected to the network over said linkage (col. 12, lines 15-54).

As per claim 10, Semaan, Haims, Gorsuch and Etorre disclose a method as defined by claim 6 and Semaan further discloses wherein the virtual meeting is the first virtual meeting and further including the steps of:

determining what linkage each of said plurality of attendees is connected to the network with, determining whether any other virtual meetings are occurring at least partially concurrently with the first virtual meeting, wherein said first and second meetings are different from one another (col. 10, line 64-col. 11, line 29; col. 12, lines 15-54).

As per claim 36, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 10 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim.

As per claim 37, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 7-10 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim.

As per claim 41, recites subject matter similar to the limitations already rejected with respect to claim 3, 4, and 12 above; therefore this claim is rejected on the same basis as used in that claim.

20. Claims 28 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. 5,680,392) Haims et al (US Pub 2003/0105820 A1) and Gorsuch et al (US 6,526,281 B1), as applied above, and in further view of Blinken et al. (U.S. 4,796,293) and Official Notice.

As per claim 28, Semaan does not expressly disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and further including the step of specifying an early join time before said start time before which said at least one attendee cannot join the meeting and a late time after which said at least one attendee cannot join the meeting.

Blinken et al. discloses that "latecomers" will not be able to join a conference after a certain amount of time has expired (col. 7, lines 18-21).

Additionally, Examiner takes Official Notice that specifying an early join time before a start time before which an attendee cannot join a meeting is an old and well known function of scheduling online/virtual meetings.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the online conference scheduling system of Semaan with the features taught by Blinken et al. and Official Notice because the invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per claim 39, Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch disclose a method as defined by claim 1 and Semaan further teaches including the steps of creating a pass key for entry to said meeting (59-61).

Semaan is silent on sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication.

Blinken teaches sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication (col. 13, lines 1-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Semaan, Haims and Gorsuch the sending said pass key to said plurality of attendees in a communication separate from said meeting invitation communication as taught by Blinken since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FOLASHADE ANDERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3331. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Folashade Anderson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Andre Boyce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623